

Karma M. Giulianelli (SBN 184175)
 karma.giulianelli@bartlitbeck.com
BARTLIT BECK LLP
 1801 Wewetta St., Suite 1200
 Denver, Colorado 80202
 Telephone: (303) 592-3100

Hae Sung Nam (*pro hac vice*)
 hnam@kaplanfox.com
KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
 850 Third Avenue
 New York, NY 10022
 Telephone: (212) 687-1980

Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation

Steve W. Berman (*pro hac vice*)
 steve@hbsslaw.com
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
 1301 Second Ave., Suite 2000
 Seattle, WA 98101
 Telephone: (206) 623-7292

Eamon P. Kelly (*pro hac vice*)
 ekelly@sperling-law.com
SPERLING & SLATER P.C.
 55 W. Monroe, Suite 3200
 Chicago, IL 60603
 Telephone: (312) 641-3200

Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation and Attorneys for Pure Sweat Basketball, Inc.

Bonny E. Sweeney (SBN 176174)
 bsweeney@hausfeld.com
HAUSFELD LLP
 600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 633-1908

Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation and Attorneys for Peekya App Services, Inc.

[Additional counsel appear on signature page]

Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)
 paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
 Four Embarcadero Center, 27th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 591-7500

Christine A. Varney (*pro hac vice*)
 cvarney@cravath.com
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
 825 Eighth Avenue
 New York, New York 10019
 Telephone: (212) 474-1000

Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. in Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.

Brendan P. Glackin (SBN 199643)
 bglackin@agutah.gov
OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL
 160 E 300 S, 5th Floor
 PO Box 140872
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872
 Telephone: (801) 366-0260

Counsel for Utah

Glenn D. Pomerantz (SBN 112503)
 glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
 350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90071
 Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Brian C. Rocca (SBN 221576)
 brian.rocca@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
 Telephone: (415) 442-1000

Daniel M. Petrocelli, Bar No. 97802
 dpetrocelli@omm.com
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
 1999 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Fl.
 Los Angeles, CA 90067-6035
 Telephone: (310) 553-6700

Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

**IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case
No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

*In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust
Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD

*In re Google Play Developer Antitrust
Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD

State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case
No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

**STIPULATED [PROPOSED]
SUPPLEMENTAL PROTECTIVE
ORDER GOVERNING SOURCE CODE**

Judge: Hon. James Donato

1 WHEREAS, on December 10, 2020, the Court entered a Stipulated Protective Order in
 2 the above-captioned cases, Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD, Dkt. No. 110, approving Dkt. No. 106-
 3 1; Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD, Dkt. No. 117, approving Dkt. No. 109-1; Case No. 3:20-cv-
 4 05792-JD, Dkt. No. 78, approving Dkt. No. 76-1, and subsequently entered the operative Second
 5 Amended Protective Order on December 20, 2021, Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD, Dkt. No. 170,
 6 approving Dkt. No. 154 (the “Protective Order”);

7 WHEREAS, on May 20, 2021, the Court entered a Stipulated Supplemental Protective
 8 Order Governing Production of Protected Non-Party Materials in the above-captioned cases,
 9 Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD, Dkt. No. 165, Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD, Dkt. No. 147, Case No.
 10 3:20-cv-05792-JD, Dkt. No. 117, and subsequently entered the operative Amended Supplemental
 11 Protective Order Governing Production of Protected Non-Party Materials on October 22, 2021,
 12 Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD, Dkt. No. 124, approving Dkt. No. 117 (“Supplemental Protective
 13 Order re: Non-Party Materials”).

14 WHEREAS, materials that Parties intend to produce in the Litigations may contain
 15 Source Code (as defined herein);

16 WHEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that documents or information disclosed or
 17 produced by Parties to the extent such documents or information are designated as containing
 18 Source Code in connection with the Litigations shall be subject to the following provisions (the
 19 “Supplemental Protective Order Re: Source Code”):

20 **1. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

21 1.1 The definitions, terms and provisions contained in the Protective Order and
 22 Supplemental Protective Order re: Non-Party Materials shall be incorporated herein by
 23 reference as though fully set forth herein; provided, however, that in the event of a conflict
 24 between any definition, term, or provision of this Supplemental Protective Order re: Source
 25 Code and any definition, term, or provision of the Protective Order and/or Supplemental
 26 Protective Order re: Non-Party Materials, this Supplemental Protective Order re: Source Code
 27 will control with respect to such conflict.
 28

1.2 The definitions, terms and provisions contained in this Supplemental Protective Order shall apply only to those Discovery Materials designated as Source Code in accordance with this Supplemental Protective Order re: Source Code, and nothing herein shall provide any rights or protections to the Parties to the Litigations beyond those set forth in the Protective Order.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1 Confidential Information or Items: information (regardless of how it is generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things that qualify for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).

2.2 Source Code: extremely sensitive “Confidential Information or Items” consisting of non-publicly available computer code and associated comments and revision histories, formulas, engineering specifications, or schematics that define or otherwise describe in detail the algorithms or structure of software or hardware designs, disclosure of which other than pursuant to the terms of this Supplemental Protective Order re: Source Code would create a substantial risk of serious harm to the Producing Party that could not be avoided by less restrictive means.

2.3 Source Code Documents: a pleading, exhibit, expert report, discovery document, deposition transcript, other Court document, or any drafts of these documents, that contains limited excerpts of Source Code.

3. INFORMATION DESIGNATED RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE

3.1 The RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE designation is reserved for Source Code. The following conditions shall govern the production, review and use of Source Code.

3.2 All such Source Code designated as “RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE,” shall be subject to the following provisions:

(a) Source Code, to the extent any Producing Party agrees to provide any such information, shall ONLY be made available for inspection, not produced except as provided for below, and shall be made available in electronic format at an office of the Producing Party's Counsel or at a location mutually agreed upon by the Receiving and Producing Parties. Any review location shall be in the continental United States. Source Code will be loaded on one or more (as proportionate to the volume of source code to be reviewed) non-networked computers ("Source Code Computer(s)") that are password protected and maintained in a secure, locked area. Except as otherwise provided, use or possession of any input/output device (*e.g.*, USB memory stick, cameras or any camera-enabled device, CDs, floppy disk, portable hard drive, laptop, or any devices that can access the Internet or any other network or external system, etc.) will be prohibited while accessing the computer(s) containing the Source Code. Proper identification of all authorized persons shall be provided prior to any access to the locked area or the Source Code Computer(s). Proper identification requires showing, at a minimum, a photo identification card sanctioned by the government of any State of the United States, or by the government of the United States. All persons entering the locked room containing the Source Code must agree to submit to reasonable security measures to ensure they are not carrying any prohibited items before they will be given access to the locked room. The computer(s) containing Source Code will be made available for inspection during regular business hours on normal business days, upon reasonable notice to the Producing Party, which shall not be less than three business days in advance of the requested inspection. The Producing Party may visually monitor the activities of the Receiving Party's representatives during any source code review, but only to ensure that there is no unauthorized recording, copying, or transmission of the source code. The Producing Party shall not be permitted to view any work product generated by the Receiving Party or the Receiving Party's representative(s), and the Producing Party shall not install any keystroke or other monitoring software on the Source Code Computer(s).

(b) The Receiving Party's Outside Counsel of Record and/or Experts may

1 request that commercially available licensed software tools for viewing and searching Source
2 Code be installed on the Source Code Computer(s). If the Producing Party has access to or a
3 license for such software, it shall install such software in advance of the source code review. If
4 the Producing Party does not have access to or a license for such software, it shall notify the
5 Receiving Party at least ten business days in advance of the inspection, who will then have an
6 opportunity to provide the Producing Party such software tool(s) at least four business days in
7 advance of the inspection, which will then be installed on the Source Code Computer(s).

8 (c) The Producing Party shall provide the Receiving Party with information
9 explaining how to start, log on to, and operate the Source Code Computer(s) in order to access
10 the Source Code at the time of the review.

11 (d) The Receiving Party shall be entitled to take handwritten notes relating
12 to the Source Code but may not copy the Source Code into such notes. Any such notes shall not
13 include copies or reproductions of portions of the Source Code; however, the notes may contain
14 filenames, directory names, module names, class names, parameter names, variable names,
15 function names, method names, comments or procedure names. No copies of all or any portion
16 of the source code may leave the room in which the Source Code is inspected except as
17 otherwise provided herein. Further, no other written or electronic record of the Source Code is
18 permitted except as otherwise provided herein. No notes shall be made or stored on the Source
19 Code Computer(s), or left behind at the site where the Source Code Computer(s) are made
20 available, and any such notes shall be deleted or destroyed by the Producing Party, without
21 reviewing the substance of the notes, upon discovery. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any such
22 notes shall be stamped and treated as "RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL-SOURCE CODE."

23 (e) No person shall copy, e-mail, transmit, upload, download, print,
24 photograph or otherwise duplicate any portion of the designated Source Code, except the
25 Receiving Parties may request a reasonable number of pages of Source Code to be printed by
26 the Producing Party, but only if and to the extent necessary for use in this action. The
27 Receiving Parties may not print more than twenty-five consecutive pages of Source Code and
28

1 an aggregate total of more than 1000 pages of Source Code unless the Producing Party agrees,
2 provided that the Producing Party agrees not to object to the Receiving Parties' request so long
3 as these limits are not exceeded. In order to print more than twenty-five consecutive pages of
4 Source Code or an aggregate of more than 1000 Pages of Source Code, the Receiving Parties
5 must obtain the prior written approval of the Producing Party. Within five business days or such
6 additional time as necessary due to volume requested, the Producing Party will provide four
7 copies of the requested material on watermarked or colored paper bearing Bates numbers and
8 the legend "RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE" on each page, unless
9 objected to as discussed below. The printed pages shall constitute part of the Source Code
10 produced by the Producing Party in this action. All copies shall be handled as if they are
11 originals consistent with the terms of this Order. The printed pages must be produced in a
12 legible, clear fashion, and shall not be rasterized or blurred or in any way distorted from the
13 generated pdf original during the production process.

14 (f) If the Receiving Parties request printing in excess of twenty-five
15 consecutive pages or an aggregate total of more than 1000 pages of the Source Code and the
16 Producing Party objects, the Producing Party shall make such objection known to the Receiving
17 Parties within five business days. If after meeting and conferring the Producing Party and the
18 Receiving Parties cannot resolve the objection (where such meet-and-confer need not take place
19 in person), the Receiving Party shall be entitled, but not required, to seek a Court resolution of
20 whether the printed Source Code in question is reasonably necessary to any case preparation
21 activity. Contested Source Code print outs need not be produced to the Requesting Parties until
22 the matter is resolved by the Court.

23 (g) Any printed pages of Source Code designated by the Producing Party as
24 "RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE" may not be copied, digitally imaged or
25
26
27
28

1 otherwise duplicated, except in limited excerpts necessary to attach as exhibits to depositions,
2 expert reports, or court filings as discussed below.

3 (h) Any paper copies designated “RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL -
4 SOURCE CODE” shall be stored or viewed only at (i) the offices of Outside Counsel of Record
5 for the Receiving Party, (ii) the offices of outside Experts or consultants who have been
6 approved to access Source Code; (iii) the site where any deposition is taken; (iv) the courthouse;
7 or (v) any intermediate location necessary to transport the information to a hearing, trial or
8 deposition. Any such paper copies shall be maintained at all times in a secure location under
9 the direct control of Counsel responsible for maintaining the security and confidentiality of the
10 designated materials or under the direct control of such Counsel’s Experts or consultants who
11 have been approved to access Source Code.

12 (i) A list of names of persons who will view the Source Code at the office
13 of the Producing Party’s Counsel or at a location mutually agreed upon by the Receiving and
14 Producing Parties will be provided to the Producing Party in conjunction with any written
15 (including email) notice requesting inspection. The Receiving Party shall maintain a daily log
16 of the names of persons who enter the locked room to view the Source Code and when they
17 enter and depart. The Producing Party shall be entitled to have a person observe all entrances
18 and exits from the Source Code viewing room, and to a copy of the log, but only to ensure that
19 there is no unauthorized access, recording, copying or transmission of the Source Code.

20 (j) Unless otherwise agreed in advance by the Parties in writing, following
21 each inspection, the Receiving Party’s Outside Counsel of Record and/or Experts shall remove
22 all notes, documents, and all other materials from the room that may contain work product
23 and/or attorney-client privileged information. The Producing Party shall not be responsible for
24 any items left in the room following each inspection session.

25 (k) The Receiving Party will not copy, remove, or otherwise transfer any
26 portion of the Source Code from the Source Code Computer(s) including, without limitation,
27 copying, removing, or transferring any portion of the Source Code onto any other computers or
28

peripheral equipment. The Receiving Party will not transmit any portion of the Source Code in any way from the location of the Source Code inspection.

(l) Only the following individuals shall have access to “RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE” materials, absent the express written consent of the Producing Party or further court order:

i. Outside counsel of Record for the Parties to this action, including any attorneys, paralegals, technology specialists and clerical employees of their respective law firms;

ii. Up to three Experts and/or consultants per Plaintiff Group (except upon the express written consent of the Producing Party, such consent not to be unreasonably withheld), pre-approved in accordance with Paragraphs 6.1-6.7 and specifically identified as eligible to access Source Code. For the avoidance of doubt, Plaintiff Group shall refer to the Plaintiff or putative class of Plaintiffs in one of the following actions: (i) *Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD; (ii) *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD; (iii) *In re Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD; and (iv) *State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD.

iii. The Court, its technical advisor (if one is appointed), the jury, court personnel, and court reporters or videographers recording testimony or other proceedings in this action. Court reporters and/or videographers shall not retain or be given copies of any portions of the Source Code. If used during a deposition, the deposition record will identify the exhibit by its production numbers;

iv. While testifying at deposition or trial in this action only: (i) any current or former officer, director or employee of the Producing Party or original source of the information; (ii) any person designated by the Producing Party to provide testimony pursuant to Rule 30(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; and/or (iii) any person who authored, previously received (other than in connection with this litigation), or was directly involved in

1 creating, modifying, or editing the Source Code, as evident from its face or reasonably certain in
2 view of other testimony or evidence. Persons authorized to view Source Code pursuant to this
3 sub-paragraph shall not retain or be given copies of the Source Code except while so testifying.

4 (m) The Receiving Party's Outside Counsel of Record shall maintain a log of
5 all copies of the Source Code (received from a Producing Party) that are delivered by the
6 Receiving Party to any qualified person under Paragraph l above. The log shall include the
7 names of the recipients and reviewers of copies and locations where the copies are stored. Upon
8 request by the Producing Party, the Receiving Party shall provide reasonable assurances and/or
9 descriptions of the security measures employed by the Receiving Party and/or qualified person
10 that receives a copy of any portion of the Source Code;

11 (n) Except as provided in this paragraph, the Receiving Party may not create
12 electronic images, or any other images, of the Source Code from the paper copy for use on a
13 computer (*e.g.*, may not scan the source code to a PDF, or photograph the code). The Receiving
14 Party may create an electronic copy or image of limited excerpts of Source Code only to the
15 extent necessary in a pleading, exhibit, expert report, discovery document, deposition transcript,
16 other Court document, or any drafts of these documents (*i.e.*, Source Code Documents). The
17 Receiving Party shall only include such excerpts as are reasonably necessary for the purposes
18 for which such part of the Source Code is used. Images or copies of Source Code shall not be
19 included in correspondence between the parties (references to production numbers shall be used
20 instead) and shall be omitted from pleadings and other papers except to the extent permitted
21 herein. The Receiving Party may create an electronic image of a selected portion of the Source
22 Code only when the electronic file containing such image has been encrypted using
23 commercially reasonable encryption software including password protection. The
24 communication and/or disclosure of electronic files containing any portion of Source Code shall
25 at all times be limited to individuals who are authorized to see Source Code under the
26 provisions of this Protective Order. The Receiving Party shall maintain a log of all electronic
27 images and paper copies of Source Code in its possession or in the possession of its retained
28

consultants, including the names of the recipients and reviewers of any electronic or paper copies and the locations where the copies are stored. Additionally, all electronic copies must be labeled “RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE.”

(o) To the extent portions of Source Code are quoted in a Source Code Document, either (1) the entire document will be stamped and treated as RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE or (2) those pages containing quoted Source Code will be separately bound, and stamped and treated as RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE.

(p) All copies of any portion of the Source Code in whatever form shall be securely destroyed if they are no longer in use. Copies of Source Code that are marked as deposition exhibits shall not be provided to the Court Reporter or attached to deposition transcripts; rather, the deposition record will identify the exhibit by its production numbers.

(q) The Receiving Party’s outside counsel may only disclose a copy of the Source Code to individuals specified in Paragraph (l) above (*e.g.*, Source Code may not be disclosed to in-house counsel).

4. PROSECUTION BAR

Absent written consent from the Producing Party, any individual who receives access to any information that is designated RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE shall not be involved in the prosecution of patents or patent applications relating to the following subject matters: a) automated scanning of mobile apps; b) automatic updating of mobile apps in a store; and/or c) in-app purchasing on mobile devices, excluding patent or patent applications directed at blockchain technologies (“Subject Matter Categories”). The Parties agree that these Subject Matter Categories may need to be supplemented if additional Source Code is requested after entry of this Order.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, nothing herein shall preclude any individual from the prosecution of patents or patent applications relating to any of the foregoing Subject Matter Categories unless such individual in fact reviewed RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL –

1 SOURCE CODE information relating to that Subject Matter Category. For example, an
 2 individual who reviewed RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE information
 3 relating to automatic updating of mobile apps in a store, but not in-app purchasing on mobile
 4 devices, would not be prohibited from the prosecution of patents or patent applications relating
 5 exclusively to in-app purchasing on mobile devices.

6 Each individual who receives access to information designated RESTRICTED
 7 CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE shall provide an attestation that identifies whether they
 8 reviewed RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE information in each of the
 9 Subject Matter Categories. For example, an individual who reviewed RESTRICTED
 10 CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE information relating to automatic updating of mobile apps
 11 in a store shall provide an attestation stating that they reviewed that category of Source Code. In
 12 addition, as set forth in Attachment B, the Producing Party may limit an individual’s access to
 13 certain areas of Source Code and/or the individual may not access certain areas of Source Code
 14 based on the Subject Matter Categories identified in that individual’s attestation.

15 The parties will meet and confer in good faith on the process for accessing relevant
 16 categorical source code and providing attestations. For purposes of this Paragraph 4,
 17 “prosecution” includes directly or indirectly drafting, amending, advising, or otherwise affecting
 18 the scope or maintenance of patent claims. To avoid any doubt, “prosecution” as used in this
 19 paragraph does not include representing a party challenging or defending a patent before a
 20 domestic or foreign agency (including, but not limited to, a reissue protest, ex parte
 21 reexamination or inter partes reexamination). This Prosecution Bar shall begin when inspection
 22 of RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE information is first conducted by the
 23 affected individual and shall end 2 years after the individual has last viewed the RESTRICTED-
 24 CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE.

25 **5. ACQUISITION BAR**

26 Absent written consent from the Producing Party, any individual who receives access to
 27 any information that is designated RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE shall
 28

not engage in any activity related to: (i) the acquisition of patents or patent applications (for any person or entity) relating to the Subject Matter Categories identified in Paragraph 4; or (ii) advising or counseling clients regarding the same.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, nothing herein shall preclude any individual from such acquisition or counseling activity relating to any of the Subject Matter Categories unless such individual in fact reviewed RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE information relating to that Subject Matter Category. Each individual who receives access to information designated RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE shall provide an attestation that identifies whether they reviewed RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE information in each of the Subject Matter Categories, under the same terms and guidance as Paragraph 4. This Acquisition Bar shall begin when inspection of RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE information is first conducted by the affected individual and shall end 2 years after the individual has last viewed the RESTRICTED-CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE.

6. DISCLOSURE OF SOURCE CODE TO EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

6.1 Information designated by the Producing Party under the category of Source Code and such copies of this information as are reasonably necessary for maintaining, defending or evaluating this litigation may be furnished and disclosed to the Receiving Party's Experts and consultants.

6.2 No disclosure of Source Code to an Expert or consultant shall occur until that person has signed the form attached hereto as Attachment A, and a signed copy has been provided to the Producing Party; and to the extent there has been an objection under paragraph 6.3, that objection is resolved according to the procedures set forth below.

6.3 A party desiring to disclose Source Code to an Expert or consultant shall also give prior written notice of the intended disclosure by email to the Producing Party and the Producing Party shall have three business days after such notice is given to object in writing to the disclosure. The party desiring to disclose Source Code to an Expert or consultant must

1 provide the following information for each Expert or consultant: name; city and state of primary
2 residence; curriculum vitae; current employer; employment history for the past five years and a
3 listing of cases in which the witness has testified as an expert at trial or by deposition within the
4 preceding five years. No Source Code shall be disclosed to such Expert(s) or consultant(s) until
5 after the expiration of the foregoing notice period and resolution of any objection.

6 Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, any information provided by a Receiving Party
7 pursuant to this paragraph shall be used by the Producing Party exclusively for purposes of
8 ensuring that disclosure of Source Code to such Expert or consultant will not result in business
9 or economic harm to the Producing Party. No information provided pursuant to the provisions
10 of this paragraph shall be used by a Producing Party in depositions or at trial, or in any other
11 effort to gain litigation advantage in the above-captioned proceedings.

12 6.4 A party objecting to disclosure of Source Code to an Expert or consultant
13 shall state with particularity the ground(s) of the objection. The objecting party's consent to the
14 disclosure of Source Code to an Expert or consultant shall not be unreasonably withheld, and its
15 objection must be based on that party's good faith belief that disclosure of its Source Code to
16 the Expert or consultant will result in specific business or economic harm to that party.

17 6.5 If after consideration of the objection, the party desiring to disclose the
18 Source Code to an Expert or consultant refuses to withdraw the Expert or consultant, that party
19 shall provide notice to the objecting party. Thereafter, the objecting party shall move the Court,
20 within three business days of receiving such notice, for a ruling on its objection. A failure to
21 file a motion within the three business day period, absent an agreement of the parties to the
22 contrary or for an extension of such three business day period, shall operate as an approval of
23 disclosure of the Source Code to the Expert or consultant. The parties agree to cooperate in
24 good faith to shorten the time frames set forth in this paragraph if necessary to abide by any
25 discovery or briefing schedules.

26 6.6 The objecting party shall have the burden of showing to the Court "good
27 cause" for preventing the disclosure of its Source Code to the Expert or consultant. This "good
28

cause” shall include a particularized showing that: (1) the Source Code is Confidential Information or Items, (2) disclosure of the Source Code likely would result in a clearly defined and serious injury to the objecting party’s business, (3) the proposed Expert or consultant is in a position to allow the Source Code to be disclosed to or become known by the objecting party’s competitors, and (4) that the Expert’s or consultant’s access to Source Code may create other confidentiality or legal risks in connection with other patent-related activities or interests tied to the Expert or consultant.

6.7 A party who has not previously objected to disclosure of Source Code to an Expert or consultant or whose objection has been resolved with respect to previously produced information shall not be precluded from raising an objection to an Expert or consultant at a later time with respect to materials or information that are produced after the time for objecting to such an Expert or consultant has expired. Any such objection shall be handled in accordance with the provisions set forth above in Section 6.1 through 6.6.

7. EXPORT CONTROL

7.1 Disclosure of Source Code shall be subject to all applicable laws and regulations relating to the export of technical data contained in such Source Code, including the release of such technical data to foreign persons or nationals in the United States or elsewhere. The Producing Party shall be responsible for identifying any such controlled technical data, and the Receiving Party shall take measures necessary to ensure compliance. Without the Receiving Parties agreeing that any laws or regulations relating to the export of technical data apply to any Source Code in this matter, Receiving Parties and their experts or consultants shall not remove any Source Code from the United States without providing Producing Party prior notification and giving Producing Party five calendar days to object. Such objections will be subject to the procedure set forth in Section 6.1 through 6.6. For the avoidance of doubt, the restrictions set forth in this paragraph shall not apply to handwritten notes as described in 3.2(d).

**ATTACHMENT A TO THE AGREED SUPPLEMENTAL PROTECTIVE ORDER
GOVERNING SOURCE CODE CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT**

1. My name is _____.
2. I reside at _____.
3. My present employer is _____.
4. My present occupation or job description is _____.
5. I have read the Agreed Supplemental Protective Order Governing Source Code dated _____, and have been engaged as _____ on behalf of _____ in the preparation and conduct of litigation styled [CASE CAPTION].
6. I am fully familiar with and agree to comply with and be bound by the provisions of said Order. I understand that I am to retain all copies of any documents designated as RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE, or any similar designation, in a secure manner, and that all copies are to remain in my personal custody until I have completed my assigned duties, whereupon the copies and any writings prepared by me containing any information designated RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL - SOURCE CODE, or any similar designation, are to be returned to counsel who provided me with such material.
7. I will not divulge to persons other than those specifically authorized by said Order and will not copy or use except solely for the purpose of this action, any information obtained pursuant to said Order, except as provided in said Order. I also agree to notify any stenographic or clerical personnel who are required to assist me of the terms of said Order.
8. In accordance with paragraph 5.3 of the Agreed Supplemental Protective Order Governing Source Code Order (if applicable), I have attached my resume, curriculum vitae or other information to this executed Confidentiality Agreement sufficient to identify my current employer and employment history for the past five years, and the cases in which I have testified as an expert at trial or by deposition within the preceding five years.
9. I state under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

By: _____

Executed on _____ 20____.

**ATTACHMENT B TO THE AGREED SUPPLEMENTAL PROTECTIVE ORDER
GOVERNING SOURCE CODE CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT**

- Subject Matter Category: Automated Scanning of Mobile Apps: An individual who accesses or seeks access to the following source code directories must attest to the review of source code that scans apps on both Android clients and the Play Store servers for policy violations, including Google Play Protect and Advanced Protection Program.
 - /java/com/google
 - /quality
 - /security
 - /wireless
- Subject Matter Category: Automatic Updating of Mobile Apps in a Store: An individual who accesses or seeks access to the following source code directories must attest to the review of source code that is responsible for automatically updating apps distributed by the Play Store.
 - /play/console
 - /wireless
- Subject Matter Category: In-App Purchasing on Mobile Devices (excluding patent or patent applications directed at blockchain technologies): An individual who seeks access to the following source code directories must attest to the review of source code that is responsible for in-app purchasing within Play on Android devices
 - /wireless

1 Dated: April 7, 2022

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

Christine Varney (*pro hac vice*)

2 Katherine B. Forrest (*pro hac vice*)

3 Darin P. McAtee (*pro hac vice*)

Gary A. Bornstein (*pro hac vice*)

4 Timothy G. Cameron (*pro hac vice*)

Yonatan Even (*pro hac vice*)

5 Lauren A. Moskowitz (*pro hac vice*)

6 Omid H. Nasab (*pro hac vice*)

Justin C. Clarke (*pro hac vice*)

7 M. Brent Byars (*pro hac vice*)

8 FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)

9 Respectfully submitted,

10 By: /s/ Justin C. Clarke

11 Justin C. Clarke

12 *Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.*

14 Dated: April 7, 2022

BARTLIT BECK LLP

15 Karma M. Giulianelli

16 KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP

17 Hae Sung Nam

18 Respectfully submitted,

19 By: /s/ Karma Giulianelli

20 Karma M. Giulianelli

21 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in*

22 *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust*

23 *Litigation*

1 Dated: April 7, 2022

PRITZKER LEVINE LLP
Elizabeth C. Pritzker

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 By: /s/ Elizabeth Pritzker
4 Elizabeth C. Pritzker

5 *Liaison Counsel for the Proposed Class in*
6 *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust*
7 *Litigation*

8 Dated: April 7, 2022

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
Steve W. Berman
Robert F. Lopez
Benjamin J. Siegel

10 SPERLING & SLATER PC
11 Joseph M. Vanek
12 Eamon P. Kelly
13 Alberto Rodriguez

14 Respectfully submitted,

15 By: /s/ Steve Berman
Steve W. Berman

16 *Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the*
17 *Developer Class and Attorneys for Plaintiff*
18 *Pure Sweat Basketball*

1 Dated: April 7, 2022

HAUSFELD LLP

Bonny E. Sweeney
Melinda R. Coolidge
Katie R. Beran
Scott A. Martin
Irving Scher

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Bonny Sweeney
Bonny E. Sweeney

*Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the
Developer Class and Attorneys for Plaintiff
Peekya App Services, Inc.*

11 Dated: April 7, 2022

OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY
GENERAL

Brendan P. Glackin

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Brendan P. Glackin
Brendan P. Glackin

Counsel for Utah

19 Dated: April 7, 2022

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Brian C. Rocca
Sujal J. Shah
Michelle Park Chiu
Minna L. Naranjo
Rishi P. Satia

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Brian Rocca
Brian C. Rocca

Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.

1 Dated: April 7, 2022

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

Daniel M. Petrocelli

Ian Simmons

Benjamin G. Bradshaw

E. Clay Marquez

Stephen J. McIntyre

6 Respectfully submitted,

7 By: /s/ Ian Simmons

8 Ian Simmons

9 *Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

10 Dated: April 7, 2022

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

Glenn D. Pomerantz

Kyle W. Mach

Kuruvilla Olasa

Justin P. Raphael

Emily C. Curran-Huberty

Jonathan I. Kravis

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 By: /s/ Glenn D. Pomerantz

17 Glenn D. Pomerantz

18 *Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

19 **ORDER**

20 Pursuant to stipulation, it is so Ordered.

21 DATED: _____

22 _____
23 HON. JAMES DONATO

24 United States District Court Judge

E-FILING ATTESTATION

I, Brian Rocca, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document.
In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that each of the signatories
identified above has concurred in this filing.

/s/ Brian Rocca
